

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 7, 13, 25, 55, 56, 58, & 60 are pending and under examination, claims 31, 37, 49, 59, & 61 being canceled and claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-24, 26-30, 32-36, 38-42, 44-48, 50-54, & 57 being withdrawn. -30, 32-36, 38-48, 50-58, 60 & 61 are pending and claims 1, 7, 13, 25, 43, 55, 56, 58, 60, & 61 are allowed.

This Amendment responds to the aforementioned Office Action.

This Amendment responds to the aforementioned Office Action, wherein the claims as originally presented were rejected under Title 35 of United States Code, §103. The Examiner's remarks have been carefully considered and, in view of the cited art, the claims which have amended to more particularly point out the distinctly claimed what Applicants regard as the subject matter of this present invention, it is sincerely believed that the claims which remain in the instant case patentably distinguish over all the prior art references. It is respectfully requested that this Application be re-examined in view of the following remarks, that the rejections be withdrawn, and that allowable subject matter be identified.

The points raised by the Examiner in the written office action will be responded to in the order they were discussed by the Examiner in the Office Action.

Applicant notes the withdrawal of the prior indicated allowability of claims 1, 7, 13, 25, 43, 55, 56, 58, 60, and 61.

On page 2 The claims 1, 7, 13, 25, 43, 55, 56, 58, 60, and 61 were rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,027,807 to Inoue et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,152,453 to Kashima et al.

Difference between the technical features claimed and those shown in the cited references:

The initial recitation of technical features will aid in understanding the argument for allowance.

First, the heat release sheet and the heat sink described in the amended claims are used for electric equipment, and the claims have been amended to clarify this.

The Inoue reference discloses the graphite cladding sheet as used for a tuning part (column 10 line 26 - 40). The Kashima reference discloses the spherical annular seal member used in a spherical pipe joint for an automobile exhaust pipe. The technical field of the electric equipment such as a notebook computer and a mobile phone is totally different from that of the automobile. Therefore, even if the disclosure of the Inoue reference is relating to the technical field of the present invention, the disclosure of the Kashima reference is not relevant to the technical field of the present invention.

Second, the heat release sheet and the heat sink described in the amended claims are NON-ELECTRIFIABLE due to elimination of minute refuse (such as minute dust) by washing the lamination of the graphite sheet and the reticulated body with negative oxidation-reduction

potential. Neither the Inoue reference nor the Kashima reference disclose any technical feature relating to washing of the graphite sheet and/or the reticulated body. Therefore the graphite sheet and/or the reticulated body disclosed in the cited documents contain minute refuse which provides the graphite sheet and/or the reticulated body with ELECTRIFICATION.

Third, the inventive steps are totally, non-obviously different. As described above, the technical field of the present invention is totally different from that of the Kashima reference. Therefore the disclosure of the Kashima reference should not and cannot be properly adopted for the rejection of this application. Thus it would not have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teaching from the disclosure of the cited Kashima reference in the device disclosed in the Inoue reference for a purpose of providing an alternative reinforcing structure for the expanded graphite sheet.

Furthermore the heat release sheet and the heat sink according to the present invention is non-electrifiable. This non-electrification results from elimination of minute refuse by washing the graphite sheet and the reticulated body with reduction water with negative oxidation-reduction potential.

Graphite or metal itself is not electrifiable, but minute refuse contained in or adhered to the graphite or the metal is electrifiable. The electrifiable minute refuse attracts other minute refuse around the

heat release sheet or the heat sink, and then attracted minute refuse takes charge. This accumulation of the electrifiable minute refuse will cause critical trouble with electronic equipment on which the heat release sheet or the heat sink is mounted. Therefore the minute refuse contained in or adhered to the graphite sheet or the reticulated body has to be eliminated.

According to the present invention, the graphite sheet and the reticulated body is washed with reduction water with negative oxidation-reduction potential. This reduction water is capable of greatly washing out the minute refuse contained in or adhered to the graphite sheet or the reticulated body because of very small molecule cluster compared with the pure water.

Therefore the heat release sheet and the heat sink according to the claims of the present invention do not have any minute refuse, and so the heat release sheet and the heat sink of the claimed invention do not attract any other minute refuse around them.

On the other hand the graphite sheet and the reticulated body disclosed in the cited documents are NOT washed with reduction water with negative oxidation-reduction potential. Therefore refuse minute is contained in and/or adhered to them. In terms of this difference between the present claimed invention and the prior arts, the graphite sheet and the reticulated body according to the prior arts is MORE ELECTRIFIABLE than the present invention and frequently causes trouble with the electronic equipment, as compared with the present invention.

Finally, the technical feature embodied in the phrase "is non-electrifiable" and "elimination of minute refuse" described in the amended claim 1 is very germane to the issue of the device itself.

Next, the Examiner rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as there being insufficient antecedent basis for "said reticulated bodies". This limitation in the claim 25 is the introduction of a plurality. The term a plurality of said reticulated body is believed to be grammatically correct.

The rejections under §103 and §112 having been explained, met and overcome, claims 1, 7, 13, 25, 43, 55, 56, 58, 60, and 61 are currently in condition for allowance, and an indication of such is respectfully solicited.

Applicant requests reconsideration and ultimate allowability of all aspects of the case, including all of claims 1, 7, 13, 25, 43, 55, 56, 58, 60, and 61.


The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's Attorney at the number below between the hours of 1:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. Eastern Standard Time, if such will advance this case.

The withdrawn claims are believed not to have to be converted to canceled, but if Applicant's understanding is different, please contact Applicant's attorney.

Applicant requests reconsideration and ultimate allowability of all aspects of the case.

The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's Attorney at the number below between the hours of 1:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. Eastern Standard Time, if such will advance this case.

Dated: September 7, 2007 Respectfully submitted:



Curt Harrington
Registration Number 31,456
Suite 250
6300 State University Drive
Long Beach, CA 90815

Tel. (562) 594-9784
Fax. (562) 594-4414
Docket: KIYO-44


"EXPRESS MAIL" MAILING LABEL NUMBER: EM 050 335 497 US

DATE OF DEPOSIT: **September 7, 2007**

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PAPER OR FEE IS BEING DEPOSITED WITH THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE "EXPRESS MAIL POST OFFICE TO ADDRESSEE" SERVICE UNDER 37 CFR 1.10 ON THE DATE INDICATED ABOVE AND IS ADDRESSED TO:

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. BOX 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450



Curtis L. Harrington, Reg. No. 31,456